



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,793	02/27/2004	Makoto Sato	671302-2005	8148

7590 11/30/2005  
THOMAS J. KOWALSKI, Esq.  
c/o FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
745 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10151

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, HOPE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1656

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/788,793

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Hope A. Robinson

Art Unit

1656

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-12 and 14-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-12 and 14-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Application Status***

1. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1656.

2 Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2005 on September 2, 2005 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Disposition***

3. Claims 1-3 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 28-31 have been added. Claims 2-12 and 14-31 are pending. Claims 28-31 are under examination.

### ***Specification***

4. The specification remains objected to because of the following informalities:

(a) The specification remains objected to because pages 42-46 of the instant specification seem to list claims instead of on a separate page. If applicant intends this to be text, the claim numbers should be removed.

(b) The specification is objected to because "paragraphs" are referred to throughout the specification, see for example page 6 where the following appears "(paragraph 1)"; "(paragraph 2)" etc.

### ***Response to Applicant's Arguments***

Art Unit: 1656

5. Page 7 of the response filed on September 2, 2005 indicate that pages 42-46 do not represent claims but instead numbered paragraphs. It suggested that this notation is removed from the specification because the numbering of paragraphs in the specification should follow this notation "[001]" for example, furthermore, there is no indication that the referred to "paragraph 2" for example is item number 2 on page 42 instead of the paragraph that appears on page 1 of the specification for example. In addition, throughout the text of the specification reference is made to "paragraphs" which is confusing. See for example page 7 where the following appears, "...the protein according to paragraph 11, 13 or 15, wherein control of cell migration and cell death is caused by the degradation of Filamin 1 (paragraph 16)" or "[T]he present invention further relates to: a peptide that comprises a part of the protein according to any one of paragraphs 10 to 16, and has effects of controlling cell migration and cell death (paragraph 17)...". The instant specification uses language that would normally appear in a claim. It is suggested that applicant delete the references to paragraphs from the specification, especially since the actual paragraphs in the specification are not numbered. This objection remains as applicant's response did not specifically address this issue.

Correction of the above is required.

### ***Drawing***

6. As previously noted, this application contains drawings executed in color (for example, Fig. 1), however, it does not appear that a petition to accept the drawings has

Art Unit: 1656

been filed. A decision on the petition will occur under separate cover once filed.

Therefore, the drawings are objected to. Hence Figures such as Fig. 1 appears dark.

It is noted that the response filed indicated that a petition to accept the drawings was being filed currently, none has been received.

### ***Abstract***

7. The abstract is objected to because of the following informalities:

The abstract is objected to because of language problems, see for example: "controlling cell migration and cell death of such as neurons" and "an object of the present invention is to provide control cell migration".

Correction is required.

### ***Withdrawn-Claim Objection***

8. Previous objection to claims are withdrawn by virtue of submission of an amendment, which cancelled the claims.

### ***Withdrawn-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. Previous rejection to claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, written description are withdrawn by virtue of submission of an amendment, which cancelled the claims.

***New-Claim Objections***

10. Claims 28-29 and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 28 is objected to for the recitation of "and or", it is suggested that the claim is amended to recite "and/or" or just one of the two terms. In addition, the claim lacks clarity for the recitation of "or" between items (a) and (b); further there should be an "and" between items (b) and (c), not "or", for proper Markush language.

Claim 29 is objected to as the phrase "amino acid" appears with a hyphen (amino-acid).

Claim 31 is objected to because the article "an" is missing from the claim, where the claim recites "comprises expression system".

Correction is required.

***New or Amended Rejections:***

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1656

11. Claims 28-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to an isolated DNA molecule contained in (SEQ ID NOS:1, 3 or 5), a complementary sequence or a variant sequence comprising all or a part of the DNA molecule or complement thereof. The claims are also directed to said variant hybridizing to the claimed DNA, complement or a probe, wherein said variant encodes a protein that binds to Filamin 1 and inhibits cell migration. Claims 28-29 and 31 do not set forth the specific hybridization conditions considered to be stringent. The art recognizes that hybridization conditions can vary. It is noted that the instant specification provides a discussion on hybridization conditions, however, it is merely exemplary, not limiting, thus does not breathe life into the claims. In addition, a sequence that hybridizes to the sequence of interest may not necessarily encode the same protein. Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

12. Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claimed invention is directed to an isolated DNA molecule, a complement thereof and variant thereof (see for example claim 28). The claims encompass a large genus that has not been adequately described. In addition, based on the open language "comprising", the claimed fragment is unlimited, thus having an undefined structure. Therefore, the claims read on several fragments, which have not been adequately described, and there is no indication as to conserved regions/domains or where in the sequence the modifications could occur. Therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the claimed variants, thus the claimed invention lacks adequate written description. The specification fails to provide any additional representative species of the claimed genus to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. A representative number of species means that the species, which are adequately described, are representative of the entire genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, disclosure of drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, for example, structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. Furthermore, the claims encompass a sequence that has all of the complement, thus identical to the complement of the encoding DNA and said complement cannot encode the same protein.



Accordingly, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus. The claimed genus of nucleic acid fragments could encode the same proteins or proteins that are different than the one described. Therefore, the genus of claimed fragments encompasses widely variant species. As such, neither the description of the structure and function of SEQ ID NO: 1 for example, that encodes a protein that binds filamin 1 and controls cell migration and cell death is sufficient to be representative of the attributes and features of the entire genus. Based on the unlimited variations contemplated one skilled in the art would at best expect a protein that is different or at worst a protein that is not functional.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir.1991), states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in *possession of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*" (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed" (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed genus of nucleic acids, and therefore, conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The

Art Unit: 1656

compound itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993).

Therefore, for all these reasons the specification lacks adequate written description, and one of skill in the art cannot reasonably conclude that the applicant had possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed.

13. Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the DNA encoding proteins set forth in SEQ ID NOS: 2, 4 and 6 that controls cell migration and cell death, does not reasonably provide enablement for any variant thereof of the claimed DNA. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The enablement requirement refers to the requirement that the specification describe how to make and how to use the invention. There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include, but are not limited to: Quantity of Experimentation Necessary; Amount of direction or guidance presented; Presence or absence of working examples; Nature of the Invention; State of the prior art and Relative skill of those in the art; Predictability or unpredictability of the art and Breadth of

Art Unit: 1656

the claims (see *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to the instant invention are discussed below.

The amount of experimentation required to practice the claimed invention is undue as the claims encompass an unspecified amount of variants of the claimed product, which may not retain the ascribed function (encoding a protein that binds filamin 1). Additionally, on page 6 of the instant specification it is disclosed that the DNA of the present invention encodes a protein that has a sequence, which can be deleted, substituted or added with regard to one or more amino acids. Thus, the claimed invention encompasses a large amount of variability for the DNA and the encoding protein sequence and there is no correlation made between the structure and function of the claimed products following modification. Moreover, based on the large variability contemplated said DNA may encode a protein that is different and that won't bind Filamin 1. The specification does not describe properties of the claimed variants, such as size; or demonstrate any such variant retaining the activity. Claim 28 recites the language "part or all of either of these sequences" and the functional limitation of "encodes a protein that binds Filamin 1 and inhibits cell migration", however, based on there is no guaranteed that said modification will result in such a protein, nor is there any demonstration in the instant specification of the large amount of variability encompassed in the claim resulting in the desired effect. The art recognizes Filamin A regulates cortical cell migration out of the ventricular zone (Nagano et al., Nat. Cell Biol., 2002, July, vol. 4, no.7, pages 495-501). A search of the claimed sequences discloses proteins that are 69.9% or 19% identical to the claimed sequence, however, have a

Art Unit: 1656

different function and these proteins are encompassed in the claim. For example, HYSEQ INC. disclose a protein that has 73.68% identity to SEQ ID NO:1 and SEQ ID NO:2 (DNA and the encoding the protein, respectively), however, the reference indicates that the protein is useful for treating diseases of the peripheral nervous system, such a neuropathies like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's disease, Huntington's disease, Shy-Drager Syndrome, Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis etc., therefore, the instant claims and specification needs to provide sufficient information regarding the activity to the protein to be altered in the claims. Thus, due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to generate the infinite number of variants recited in the claims and possibly screen same for activity and the lack of guidance/direction provided in the instant specification, this is merely an invitation to the skilled artisan to use the current invention as a starting point for further experimentation. Thus, undue experimentation would be required for a skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Predictability of which potential changes can be tolerated in a protein's amino acid sequence and obtain the desired activity requires a knowledge of and guidance with regard to which amino acids in the protein's sequence, if any, are tolerant of modification and which are conserved (for example, expectedly intolerant to modification), and detailed knowledge of the ways in which the protein's structure relates to its function. In addition, one skilled in the art would expect any tolerance to modification for a given protein to diminish with each further and additional modification, for example, multiple substitutions. In this case, the necessary guidance has not been

Art Unit: 1656

provided in the specification. Therefore, while it is known in the art that many amino acid substitutions are possible in any given protein, the positions within the protein's sequence where such amino acid substitutions can be made with a reasonable expectation of success are limited, as certain positions in the sequence are critical to the protein's structure/function relationship. It is also known in the art that a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many cases. For example, various sites or regions directly involved in binding activity and in providing the correct three-dimensional spatial orientation of binding and active sites can be affected (see Wells, *Biochemistry*, vol. 29, pages 8509-8517, 1990). The instant specification provides no guidance/direction as to which regions of the protein would be tolerant of modifications and which would not, and it provides no working examples of any variant sequence that is encompassed by the claims. It is in no way predictable that randomly selected mutations, such as deletions, substitutions, additions, etc., in the disclosed sequences would result in a protein having activity comparable to the one disclosed. As plural substitutions for example are introduced, their interactions with each other and their effects on the structure and function of the protein is unpredictable. The skilled artisan would recognize the high degree of unpredictability that all the variants encompassed in the claims would retain the recited function.

The state of the prior art provides evidence for the high degree of unpredictability as stated above. Seffernick et al. (*J. Bacteriology*, vol. 183, pages 2405-2410, 2001) disclose two polypeptides having 98% sequence identity and 99% sequence identity,

Art Unit: 1656

differing at only 9 out of 475 amino acids (page 2407, right column, middle and page 2408, Fig. 3). The polypeptides of Seffernick et al. are identical along relatively long stretches of their respective sequences (page 2408, Fig. 3), however, these polypeptides exhibit distinct functions. The modifications exemplified in the Seffernick et al. reference is small compared to those contemplated and encompassed by the claimed invention. Further, Saus et al. (US PG PUB No. 2003010855A1, 2002) disclose a DNA encoding a protein that is 31.72% identical to SEQ ID NO:1, which encodes SEQ ID NO:2 of the instant application, and it is disclosed that the protein is a GIP family protein, proteins with transcription factor activity. The DNA encoding the protein of the Saus et al. reference is encompassed in the claimed limitation of 1 or several deletions, which demonstrates the unpredictability of the fragment.

The specification lacks adequate guidance/direction to enable a skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims. Furthermore, while recombinant and mutagenesis techniques are known in the art, it is not routine in the art to screen large numbers of mutated proteins where the expectation of obtaining similar activity is unpredictable based on the instant disclosure. The amino acid sequence of a protein determines its structural and functional properties, and predictability of what mutations can be tolerated in a protein's sequence and result in certain activity, which is very complex, and well outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a protein's function from mere sequence data are limited, therefore, the general knowledge and skill in the art is not sufficient, thus the specification needs to provide an enabling disclosure.

The working examples provided do not rectify the missing information in the instant specification pertaining to the claimed variant. The nature and properties of the claims is difficult to ascertain from the examples provided as one of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to construct the variants/fragments of the claimed invention and examine the same for function.

The specification does not provide support for the broad scope of the claims, which encompass an unspecified amount of fragments. The claims broadly read on any variant thereof for the claimed DNA or complement thereof. The issue in this case is the breath of the claims in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the skill level artisan and the guidance presented in the instant specification and the prior art of record. This make and test position is inconsistent with the decisions of *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) where it is stated that "...scope of claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art...". Without sufficient guidance, determination of having the desired biological characteristics is unpredictable and the experimentation left to those skilled in the art is unnecessarily and improperly extensive and undue. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Thus, for all these reasons, the specification is not considered to be enabling for one skilled in the art to make and use the claimed invention as the amount of experimentation required is undue, due to the broad scope of the claims, the lack of guidance and working examples provided in the specification and the high degree of

Art Unit: 1656

unpredictability as evidenced by the state of the prior art, attempting to construct and test variants of the claimed invention would constitute undue experimentation. Making and testing the infinite number of possible fragments to find one that functions as described is undue experimentation. Therefore, applicants have not provided sufficient guidance to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention in a manner that reasonably correlates with the scope of the claims, to be considered enabling.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

14. Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter, which applicant (s) regard as their invention.

Claim 28 is indefinite for the recitation of: (a) a variant that has all of the sequences in the complement as the complement of the encoding DNA cannot encode the same protein; and (b) "stringent hybridization conditions" as the claim does not set forth what conditions are deemed to be stringent, thus the metes and bounds of the claim is undefined, as the art recognizes that the conditions can vary such as the wash conditions. Further, the discussion provided in the instant specification is not limiting, therefore does not breathe life into the claims or establish a standard for the claimed invention. The dependent claim hereto is also included in this rejection as it does not rectify the deficiency.



***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

15. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 31 is drawn to a host cell, which reads on a product of nature. The claim, as written, does not sufficiently distinguish over cells as they exist naturally because the claim does not particularly point out any non-naturally occurring differences between the claimed product and the naturally occurring product. In the absence of the hand of man, the naturally occurring product is considered non-statutory subject matter. See *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 206 USPQ 193 (1980). The claim should be amended to indicate the hand of the inventor, for example, by the insertion of "isolated" in connection with the host cell to identify a product not found in nature (see MPEP 2105).

***New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1656

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dyson et al. (The Journal of Cell Biology, vol. 155, no. 6, pages 1065-1079, 2001), based on the broad recitation of a variant sequence amino acids are deleted, substituted or added; a sequence comprising part or all of either of the sequences in item (a-b) of claim 28.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of claims 28 and 29, is a sequence that binds filamin as item (c) of claim 28 and item (b) of claim 29 requires very little structure with the functional limitation. Dyson et al. disclose a DNA encoding a protein, which binds filamin, thus reads on the claims. As the claimed language of "all or part of" can be interpreted as 5 nucleotides the structure disclosed in the reference would hybridize to the claimed sequences set forth in SEQ ID NOS: 1, 3 or 5. In addition, the reference teaches expression in a host cell (claim 31). Therefore, the limitations of the claims are met by this reference.

### ***Response to Applicant's Arguments***

17. The response filed on September 2, 2005 has been considered. Note that the rejections of record remain and have been amended to apply to newly submitted claims 28-31. The response on page 9 state that the written description of record does not apply to the newly submitted claims as applicant opine that a representative number of species is disclosed for the genus. Applicant points to L-FILIP; S-FILIP etc., however, other sequences are included in the present claim language for which examples are

Art Unit: 1656

provided in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph enablement, see for example Saus et al. The claims are not limited to a specific size for the variants, which may not exhibit the desired properties, however, such variability is encompassed in the claims. On page 10 it is stated that properties such as hybridization conditions are recited in the claims. This argument is not persuasive as claims 28-29 and 31 do not specify what applicant deems to be "stringent hybridization conditions". Furthermore, sequences that would hybridize to the claimed DNA may not encode the same protein, nor would the complement encode said protein. On page 11 it is stated that the phrase "comprising" does not render the genus of claimed sequence indefinite. Applicant is reminded that "indefinite" corresponds to rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, thus applicant is supposed to be presenting arguments against a written description rejection. The issue here is that the open language comprising means that the claimed sequence could have 3 nucleotides, 10 nucleotides, 15 nucleotides, 25 nucleotides etc., thus no upper limit on the variants and there is no indication as to whether said sequence represents a contiguous run of nucleotides or if a functional protein will result from large variability encompassed or if the claimed properties will be retained. Further, a skilled artisan cannot envision all the structures encompassed in the claims and the disclosure does not demonstrate possession of all that is encompassed in the claims. Thus, for the reasons stated herein and above the claimed invention lacks adequate written description.

Regarding the enablement rejection, applicant states that the new claims satisfy the enablement requirements (page 11 of the response). Applicant states that the new

Art Unit: 1656

claims do not encompass an unspecified amount of protein fragments. This statement is inaccurate. The claimed invention is directed to variants of the claimed DNA which can result in many different protein products, furthermore, the instant specification on page 6 indicate that the claimed invention is directed to amino acid sequences wherein one or more deletion, addition etc. is included. Applicant further state that undue experimentation is not required to practice the claimed invention (page 12 of the response). This argument is not persuasive, as routine experimentation is included in the statute, however, undue experimentation is not. To construct all the variants encompassed in the claim and test the same for function (encoding said protein with said properties) would require undue experimentation. Further, the specification lacks guidance as to where in the structure variations will occur or what regions are conserved. The art recognizes how unpredictable the claimed invention is and a number of examples are cited above that are specific to the Filamin protein. Thus, significant experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

Note that new grounds of rejections have been instituted under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and 102(b) for the reasons set forth above and based on applicant's amendments to the claims. As the rejections of record have been withdrawn, applicant's statements on page 13 of the response are moot. This response is deemed sufficient to address the issues raised by applicant.

### ***Conclusion***

18. No claims are presently allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hope A. Robinson whose telephone number is 571-272-0957. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr, can be reached at (571) 272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hope Robinson, MSC *HR*

Patent Examiner *11/22/05*

**HOPE ROBINSON  
PATENT EXAMINER**